

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 3, 6 through 26, 28 through 41, 43, 45 through 63 and 65 through 108 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 25, 26, 60 through 63 and 65 through 79 are rejected.

Claims 1 through 3, 6 through 24, 28 through 41, 43, 45 through 59 and 80 through 108 have been allowed.

This amendment is in response to the Final Rejection in the Office Action of May 26, 2005.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Anticipation Rejections**

**Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,915,231 to Beffa**

Claims 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Beffa (U.S. Patent No. 5,915,231).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

After carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicants have amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Applicants assert that the Beffa reference does not anticipate the claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 because the Beffa reference does not identically describe each and every element of the claimed invention in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. Applicants assert that the Beffa reference does not identically describe the element of the claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 25 calling for "storing data in association with the identification code of each semiconductor device of the semiconductor devices that identifies manufacturing procedures each semiconductor device of the semiconductor devices has undergone, said storing data including storing data that identifies rows and columns used

rows and columns used in repairing a semiconductor device”. Applicants assert that the Beffa reference does not describe any such element of the claimed invention. Therefore, presently amended independent claim 25 is allowable as well as dependent claim 26 therefrom.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

#### Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,915,231 to Beffa in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,326,709 to Moon et al.

Claims 60 through 63, 65 through 68, 73 and 74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beffa (U.S. Patent No. 5,915,231) in view of Moon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,326,709). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant’s disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

After carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner’s comments, Applicants have amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Applicants assert that any combination of the Beffa reference and the Moon et al. reference does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 60 because any combination of the Beffa reference and the Moon et al. reference fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Applicants assert that any combination of the Beffa reference and the Moon et al. reference fails to teach or suggest the claim limitation calling for “storing data in association with the identification code of each semiconductor device that identifies manufacturing procedures each semiconductor device has undergone, said storing data

storing data comprising storing data that identifies rows and columns used in manufacturing procedures for repairing a semiconductor device”. Applicants assert that any combination of the Beffa reference and the Moon et al. reference does not teach or suggest any such claim limitation of the claimed invention of presently amended independent claim 60. Therefore, presently amended independent claim 60 is allowable as well as the dependent claims 61 through 63 and 65 through 79 therefrom.

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 5,915,231 to Beffa in view of U.S. Patent 5,326,709 to Moon et al. as applied to claims 60 through 63, 65 through 68, 73 and 74 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,256,562 to Vu et al.

Claims 69 through 72 and 75 through 79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beffa (U.S. Patent 5,915,231) in view of Moon et al. (U.S. Patent 5,326,709) as applied to claims 60 through 63, 65 through 68, 73 and 74 above, and further in view of Vu et al. (U.S. Patent 5,256,562). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicants assert that dependent claims 69 through 72 and 75 through 79 are allowable as they depend from allowable presently amended independent claim 60.

Applicants request entry of this amendment for the following reasons:

The amendment is timely filed.

The amendment places the application in condition for allowance.

The amendment does not require any further search or consideration.

Applicants submit that claims 25, 26, 60 through 63 and 65 through 79 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants request the entry of this amendment, the allowance of claims 25, 26, 60 through 63 and 65 through 79, and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan  
Registration No. 28,393  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: July 26, 2005  
JRD/djp:lmh  
Document in ProLaw